DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 053 FL 017 681

AUTHOR Hori, Motoko
TITLE Language Forms Reflecting Social Hierarchy and Psychological Attitude.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference of Applied Linguistics (8th, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, August 16-21, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; *Japanese; Language Research; *Pragmatics; Social Stratification; *Sociocultural Patterns; Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage; Surveys; Syntax; Uncommonly Taught Languages; *Verbs

ABSTRACT

A study examined how Japanese language use reflects the hierarchical and compartmentalized society and the psychological attitudes of the speaker through analysis of the verb forms used. Data were drawn from a survey of 500 individuals concerning the choice of verb form in different social situations, and from transcriptions of a housewife's conversations. Analysis of the data indicates that individuals choose verb forms in Japanese according to whom is being addressed, suggesting that the Japanese language has structured the social system in the verb form. This shows one aspect of a language in which syntax is directly related to pragmatic conditions. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301053

Language forms reflecting social hierarchy and psychological attitude

Motoko Hori
Josai University

1. Introduction

Language use has now come to be of centeral interest in the field of linguistics because it is the point where grammar (formal linguistics) and pragmatics (functional linguistics) meet and where a new interpretation of language might be discovered.

The present paper is an attempt to show a characteristic of the Japanese language whereby the use of the language (pragmatics) and its structure (syntax) are deeply intertwined. Many Western researchers have been exerting themselves to relate semantics and pragmatics but they seldom discuss the relationship between syntax and pragmatics. They take it as a matter of fact that syntax has no relevance to pragmatics, saying: "an expression cannot be impolite itself" (Fraser and Nolen 1981: 96); "there appears to be very little reason to suppose that sex differences exist in the use of syntactic forms" (Zimin 1981: 37-38). The reason might be that, in their language, syntax can only be reached through semantics, as Leech says in the explanation of his diagram: "Figure 1.3 shows that the grammar interacts with pragmatics via semantics" (1983: 12).

But there are languages whose syntax depends on pragmatics, that is, without pragmatic information one cannot make a sentence and once one makes a sentence that sentence limits the pragmatic range. Japanese is one of those such languages. Since Japanese society is organized on the concept that all individuals can be placed in a hierarchy, its language also is structured in the same way. Unless we know the relationship of the interlocutors, we cannot begin conversation because the language has internalized such pragmatic information in its structure.

I hope this paper will give an answer to the question "why grammars have the rules that they have" (Leech 1983: 25) and also to the challenge "[the pragmaticist must] show that, at least within the linguistic and philosophical tradition . . . , the term [pragmatics] does have clear application" (Levinson 1983: 6) by giving evidence that language should be discussed taking pragmatic factors as ones which dictate syntax.

2. Hypothesis

My hypothesis is that the Japanese language reflects its society and the speaker's psychological attitudes. I will discuss (1) the structure of the Japanese verb (2) some features of Japanese society and then (3) I will give evidence to support my hypothesis from the research work done during the years 1982-84. I will use the results of a questionnaire given to over 500 people and the transcriptions of conversations with over 80,000 words

FL017681

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Hori
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

3. The structure of Japanese verbs

As I am going to use Japanese as the focus of my discussion, let me explain the structure of Japanese, especially the structure of verb forms. One of the features of this language is that the verb is placed at the end of a sentence. It is possible to invert the order so as to create some special emphasis or effect, but the grammar dictates that, in normal order, the verb should go at the end of the sentence. The tense, mood, aspect, and other functions that most European languages attribute to the verb and/or auxiliary are agglutinated to the verb stem. It appears that such agglutination occurs in the kana syllabary, which is the basic graphemic unit of this language, but the real agglutination is on the morphonological level, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Conjugation of the verb "iku" and its kana syllabary

Japanese kana	Reading	English equivalent
いく	i-ku	to go
いく	i-ku	I go, you go, he goes, etc.
いった	i-t-ta > i-ki-ta*	I went, you went, etc.
いこう	i-ko	I'll go, you'll go, etc.
いかない	i-ka-na-i	I don't go, you don't go, he doesn't go, etc.
いきたい	i-ki-ta-i	I want to go, you want to go, he wants to go, etc.
いけ	i-ke	Go.
いけば	i-ke-ba	if I go/you go/he goes,etc.
いくとき	i-ku-to-ki	the time when I go/you go/ he goes, etc.
いくひと	i-ku-hi-to	the person who goes, the persons who go.

* I-t-ta is derived from i-ki-ta.

In Table 1, hyphens show where kana has a separate symbol. That is, i-ku is written with two kana symbols while i-ki-ta-i is written with four, as shown in the left column. Thus, the traditional grammar of Japanese calls i- the stem and the rest conjugation. However, from a general linguistic viewpoint, it seems much more natural to take ik- as the stem and the rest as conjugation. The differences from European languages, for example English, are that, firstly, that Japanese verbs do not conjugate according to the person or gender (see Table 1)--no matter who goes, iku is the form to be employed--and, secondly, they do conjugate according to the level of politeness (see the examples in Table 2).

Table 2 Honorific/non-honorific variants of the verb "iku"

Verb form	Speaker's attitude	Present	Past
non-honorific	not polite either to the actor or to the addressee	ik-u	it-ta
honorific	polite to the actor alone	ik-a-re-ru iras-shar-u o-ide-ni-nar-u etc.	ik-a-re-ta iras-shat-ta o-ide-ni-nat-ta etc.
	polite to the addressee alone	ik-i-mas-u	ik-i-mash-i-ta*
	polite to the actor and addressee***	ik-a-re-mas-u iras-shai-mas-u** o-ide-ni-nar-i-mas-u etc.	ik-a-re-mash-i-ta iras-shai-mash-i-ta o-ide-ni-nar-i-mash-i-ta etc.
	deferent to the addressee	mair-i-mas-u****	mair-i-mash-i-ta

* -mash- is a phonetic representation of -mas-. When followed by [i], [s] is pronounced as [ʃ] and written as sh.

** iras-shai- is a short form of iras-shar-i-.

*** 'Actor and addressee' includes the two cases: when the actor and the addressee is the same person, and when they are different persons.

**** The plain form of mairimasu is mairu; however, this form is archaic and not used in daily conversation.

Although the base form is iku, there are several alternatives, such as ikareru, irassharu, oideninaru, mairimasu, ikimasu, ikaremasu, irasshaimasu, oideninarimasu, etc. These forms all mean "to go" in the present tense. The difference is who speaks to whom. Therefore, the actor of the verb and the relationship of the three people involved (actor, addressee, and speaker) are often able to be predicted even when, as in the most common pattern of Japanese sentences, the verb form only is given, without the subject of the sentence.

Base forms like iku, itta, ikanai, etc. are used to refer to the speaker's own act and/or the act of someone who is a member of the speaker's family or someone who is lower in social status than the speaker, and the addressee is someone who is the same as or lower than the speaker. So, when the speaker says, "Kino eiga ni itta,"(Yesterday, [S] went to the movie), the one who went to the movie (the subject of the verb) could be the speaker himself/herself, his/her family member,

his/her subordinate, or a servant, and the addressee(s) could be such people. Likewise, when the speaker asks, "Kinou, eiga ni ittano?" (Yesterday, did [S] go to the movie?), the addressee (very often the subject of the verb) could be a person as described above.

On the contrary, if the speaker says, "Kinou, eiga ni ikareta" (Yesterday, [S] went to the movie), the one who went to the movie must be someone older or higher in status than the speaker but the addressee is someone of lower status than the speaker. If it is turned to a polite interrogative, "Kinou, eiga ni ikaremashita ka?" (Yesterday, did [S] go to the movie?), then the addressee also must be high status.

An honorific verb form like ikaremashita is only one of the many variants of the verb iku. If such honorific connotation is to be conveyed in English, it is beyond the function of verb conjugation, and some other scheme must be employed, such as "Did you happen to go to the movie yesterday?" "Could I ask you if you went to the movie yesterday?" "I'm wondering if you went to the movie yesterday?" etc. Of course, when the speaker feels very much obliged, the same kind of hedges are employed in Japanese also, but the single verb form, ikaremashita, or irasshaimashita, can quite adequately convey the respect and deference of the speaker. (-Ka is a particle denoting interrogative.)

While the speaker's respect/deference or non-respect/non-deference can be expressed in a single verb, the verb itself can further be analyzed. It is a widely supported theory in Japanese grammar to devide a verb into two parts, base and ending, when discussing honorifics. The base denotes the speaker's respect and/or deference to the actor, and the ending denotes the speaker's polite attitude to the addressee. In short if the speaker wants to be polite to the addressee, all he/she has to do is to add either of the honorific morphemes, -mas- or -des- to the base. If the speaker wants to be respect-ful to the actor of the verb, he/she has to employ honorific bases, suchas ikare-, irasshar-, oideni-nar-, etc. Therefore, when the actor and addressee is the same person, the highest respect can be expressed by combining these bases and endings, producing such forms as ikare-mas-, irasshai-mas-, oideninari-mas-, etc. (See Table 2.) And if neither an honorific base nor ending is employed as in the plain root iku, the speaker will not be presumed respectful or polite either to the actor or to the addressee.

Iku and oideninarimasu are two extremes on the level of politeness and there are several levels in between. To show this graded level, I established a dichotomy using plus and minus symbols. A plus denotes the presence of an honorific morpheme and minus denotes its absence. If the base itself is honorific having such morphemes as ikare-, irasshar-, and oideninar-, the representaion is <+H>. If the base has no honorific morpheme, like the plain root ik- by itself, it is represented as <-H>. If the sentence ends with either -des- or -mas-, it is represented as <+h>. If there is neither of them, it is represented as <-h>. See Table 3.

Table 3 Honorific/non-honorific base and ending of "iku"

Variants of iku	Honorific base	Honorific ending	Representation in dichotomy
iku	none	none	<-H,-h>
ikimasu	none	-masu	<-H,+h>
ikareru	ikareru	none	<+H,-h>
ikaremasu	ikare-	-masu	<+H,+h>
irassharu	irassharu	none	<+H,-h>
irasshaimasu	irasshai-	-masu	<+H,+h>
oideninaru	oideninaru	none	<+H,-h>
oideninarimasu	oideninari-	-masu	<+H,+h>
mairimasu	mairi-	-masu	<+H,+h>

Although Table 3 shows variants with an honorific ending -masu, the other honorific ending -desu, the polite form of a copular -da, can also be added. It is agglutinated to the base with a conjunctive particle -n(o)-, producing such forms as iku-n-desu, ikareru-n-desu, etc. And their representations in dichotomy are the same as with -masu: ikun-da <-H, -h>, ikun-desu <-H, +h>, ikarerun-desu <+H, +h>, etc. This ending -desu is in the complementary distribution with -masu. Such a form as ?ikimasudesu is taken to be ungrammatical and such forms as *ikidesu, *ikunmasu, or *ikundesumasu never occur.

Now, one thing might have become clear: the verb form to be employed in a sentence cannot be decided before the speaker knows whom to talk to, about whose act, and what relations those two people hold. That is, without placing the people involved in a hierarchical order, the speaker cannot decide which variant of a verb to choose. There is no neutral form, neither polite nor impolite, to be used most safely to any person. (In a big city where people do not know each other so well as in a small town, more and more people have been putting honorific endings, -desu or -masu, as a kind of neutral expression. Such extended use of <+h> suggests that many inhabitants in a big city do not feel close to other people. They want to keep distance from other people and thus try to avoid getting into trouble by using honorific forms to strangers.)

4. Some features of Japanese society

There are two fundamental tendencies among the Japanese. One is to preserve the hierarchical order in which each member of a society is placed and the other is to classify people according to whether they belong to one's group or not. The former is a vertical relationship and the latter is a relationship of in-group or out-group. These two concepts are so fundamental that Japanese people are not always aware that they are controlled by them; yet, their behavior clearly reflects how strongly they are governed by these two concepts. One or two episodes will explain it well.

Once an American professor visiting a Japanese university told me

that by watching the behavior of people at a meeting, it was quite easy for him to tell who was the most important, who was the second most, and who was the least important at the meeting, even before the people were introduced. He said that they acted quite differently to their seniors from the way they did to their colleagues and subordinates. I think he is right because I know quite a few professors who act very differently when talking to their students from when talking to their colleagues. On the contrary, it is often very hard for the Japanese to tell who is the head of a group consisting of Americans only. They seem to be behaving almost the same to everyone.

Other evidence is given in Ide et al.(1986) in the experience they had when they conducted a questionnaire in the United States and in Japan. They asked university students in both countries to think of several people they knew and place them on five levels together with the speech forms they would use to those people. The top level should list those who they think must be treated most deferentially and the bottom level should list those who can be treated most casually.

To this question Japanese students found no difficulty and wrote several people's names and language forms on each level. But American students found it almost impossible without any situational conditions. Therefore, the researchers reframed the questionnaire several times to get responses from American students.

This fact reveals the basic gap in the treatment of people and language behavior between Japan and the United States. Even without any situational conditions, Japanese students were able to think of people on different politeness levels. They could imagine each person's status in the hierarchy and the language to be used to each person.

This unconscious tendency to place people in a hierarchy is strongly reflected in Japanese sentences. As stated above, there are only two ways to end a sentence, especially in speaking, either with a polite ending -masu/-desu or without either of them, and there is no way in between. Until the speaker decides whether the addressee is above or below him/her, the speaker cannot complete a sentence. This is why many sentences are not completely enunciated in conversation. The speaker often leaves the verb unsaid, thus relieved from placing the addressee either above or below in the hierarchy. See the examples below.

1. "Kino, eiga ni . . . ?" ([Did you go] to the movie yesterday?)
2. "Hai. Anata mo . . . ?" (Yes. [Did] you [go] too?")

Thus, hierarchy consciousness has long been imbued in the Japanese mind and also in the Japanese language. Strange to say, this relationship between the society and the language has never been realized in the study of the Japanese language. The next section will illustrate how strong this relationship is.

5. The result of the research data

(1) The questionnaire

By employing the plus-minus dichotomy to analyze Japanese verbs as

explained above, I classified all the verbs which 527 informants gave in the questionnaire conducted by our group conducted in 1982-84 (1). A part of the result was published in the paper (Hori: 1986) and Table 4 and Table 5 are taken from it.

Table 4 Choice of variants of "iku" according to different categories of addressees (common to male and female informants)

Addressee	Spouse		Son/daughter		Sibling		Friend	
Informant	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<-H,-h>	98.16%	61.11%	99.56%	99.65%	72.09%	75.90%	65.57%	26.92%
<+H,-h>	1.23	10.49	0.44	0	0	7.23	5.74	46.15
<-H,+h>	0.61	22.22	0	0.35	25.58	14.46	21.31	10.44
<+H,+h>	0	6.17	0	0	2.33	2.41	7.38	16.48
N=	163	162	229	289	43	83	122	182

Addressee	Neighbor		Son's/daughter's teacher/professor	
Informant	Male	Female	Male	Female
<-H,-h>	3.39%	7.81%	0 %	0.57%
<+H,-h>	0	27.34	0	1.14
<-H,+h>	25.42	15.63	4.76	0.57
<+H,+h>	71.19	49.22	95.24	97.71
N=	59	128	63	175

(Hori 1986: 169)

The forms highest in honorifics <+H, +h> are used more often than other forms when talking to 'one's son's/daughter's teacher/professor'. The lowest in honorifics <-H, -h> are used most frequently when talking to 'son/daughter' and 'spouse'. Although there is a big difference in the ratios of 'spouse' between male and female speakers, this point is not discussed in the present paper. (See Hori (1986) for that discussion.)

Table 5 shows a clear correlation between the presence and absence of honorifics in the verb and the relational status of the addressee.

Table 5 Choice of variants of "iku" according to different categories of addressees (different for male and female informants)

Male informants' choice

Addressee	Workplace subordinate	Same status colleague	Business client	Workplace superior
<-H,-h>	80.60%	46.97%	7.27%	1.65%
<+H,-h>	0.50	3.03	0.91	0.83
<-H,+h>	16.42	40.15	16.36	7.02
<+H,+h>	2.49	9.85	75.45	90.50
N=	201	132	110	242

Female informants' choice

Addressee	Delivery person	Parent at PTA meeting	Instructor of hobby group	Spouse's superior
<-H,-h>	31.25%	2.86%	0 %	0.64%
<+H,-h>	21.25	27.62	0.88	0
<-H,+h>	36.25	6.67	0.88	0
<+H,+h>	11.25	62.86	98.23	99.36
N=	80	105	113	156

(Hori 1986: 170)

Male informants for the most part use <-H, -h> when talking to their subordinates (80.60%) while they use <+H, +h> to their superiors (90.50%). They choose <-H, -h> and <-H, +h> at about the same rate when talking to their colleagues, but toward their clients and superiors they rarely use <-h> which lacks politeness. On the contrary, they rarely use <+H> toward their subordinates and colleagues.

The female informants match the males in the choice of <+H, +h> when talking to their hobby instructors (98.23%) and their husbands' superiors (99.36%). As housewives do not have 'workplace subordinate' (86% of the female informants were housewives), they do not use <-H, -h> to anybody except their own children (99.65%). (See Table 4) Thus, the choice of verb forms well reflects the addressee's social status in relation to the speaker's social status.

(2) The transcription

Much was obtained from the answers to the questionnaire and the next job was to see if this relation between language and status was actually to be found in real conversation. For this purpose I used a transcription of conversations taken in the same framework of the research program of 1982-84.

The whole transcription was published in 1985. From this I picked up utterances of a housewife K and focused my attention on her verbal

behavior in three scenes, each differing in situational environment.

K was in her late forties at the time of recording, having lived in Tokyo for many years with her husband and two daughters. In her spare time, K taught cooking to housewives in the neighborhood. One of her daughters was a university student. One day a professor of the university visited her house. The purpose of the professor's visit was to get K's permission to taperecord her utterances for one week. This occasion is labeled as Scene 201. The occasion when K is teaching cooking to five women is labeled as Scene 602. The occasion when K is with her family, husband and two daughters, is labeled as Scene 701. If I follow Peng's "communicative distance", which is based upon Hall's "social distance", each scene has different communicative distance; Scene 201 being the remotest, Scene 701 the closest, and Scene 602 just the middle.

Hall defined his social distance by measuring the space between the interlocutors. Peng defined his communicative distance by counting differentiated use of I-words and You-words in Japanese (1976). Following their paths, I counted the number of honorific bases and endings of verb forms in order to show that the Japanese language is systematically organized to meet the fundamental need of the Japanese people who are controlled, perhaps unconsciously, by the social hierarchy. If there is a big difference in the selection of verbs among the above three scenes, and if that difference correlates with the conversational situation of each scene, then the language forms, at least those picked up for discussion in this paper, can be said to reflect the situational environment of each scene. Thus, the result of the questionnaire will be reaffirmed, and my hypothesis will be supported.

In the questionnaire, we asked the differentiated choice of the variants of the verb <u>iku</u> (to go) in the question "When do you go?" according to different kinds of addressees; for this verb has several variants with different honorific connotations, as shown in Table 3. The number of variants answered, including different particles, is as many as 84, all being the same semantically. I expected, therefore, to find quite a large number of variants of the single verb <u>iku</u> in the transcription of K's utterances. But in fact that was not so; the total occurrance of <u>iku</u> variants is 46 in 201, 28 in 602, and 18 in 701. It is impossible to discuss anything based upon such a small number in each scene. Therefore, for the discussion in this paper, I included other verbs which have more than two variants each differing in honorific connotations. The verbs included here are as follows.

Table 6 Verbs with more than two variants

Plain base	Honorific base		Meaning
	Respectful	Deferential	
aru	oarininaru	gozaru	to be
iru	irassharu	oru	to be
iku	ikareru	mairu/ukagau	to go
kuru	korareru irassharu	mairu	to come
iku/kuru	oideninaru etc.		to go/come
suru	nasaru	itasu	to do
yaru	oyarininaru	itasu	to do
taberu	meshiagaru	itadaku	to eat
morau	omorainaru	itadaku	to be given
yuu	ossharu	mousu	to say

Here are some examples of these verbs taken from the transcription of K's utterances.

3. "Son-na koto oarininari masen." (There couldn't be such a thing.) <to the professor>
4. "Sensei massuguni Shinjuku ni odemashi ni narare masu ne?" (Professor S, are you going directly to Shinjuku?) <to the professor>
5. "Soda to omoimashita." (I thought so.) <to a cooking student>
6. "Kyo otoban no kata irassharu?" (Is there a lady who is to prepare things for today's class?) <to cooking students>
7. "Shokuyoku wa aru no?" (Do you have an appetite?) <to a cooking student>
8. "Mo soto kitsui koto watashi itta wayo." (I said something very nasty.) <to her husband>
9. "Mika, shitteru?" (Mika, do you know?) <to her daughter>

From the examples above, it might be said that K uses <+H, +h>, as in (3) "oarini narimasen", (4) "odemashini narare masu", only when she is talking to the professor. She uses <-H, -h> to her family, as in (8) "itta" and (9) "shitteru". To the cooking students, K uses various forms, such as (7) "aru" <-H, -h>, (6) "irassharu" <+H, -h>, and (5) "omoimashita" <-H, +h>.

These are only a small group of samples picked up at random from the transcription, and yet they show a clear correlation between the verb forms and the addressee's status. If this correlation can be found in a large number of sentences, then it will support the hypothesis that the language form correlates with the addressee's social status.

(3) Verb forms in the three scenes

The verb forms listed in Table 6 are counted in each of the three scenes and classified according to the plus-minus representations as shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Verb forms in the three scenes

	201		602		701	
<+H, +h>	267	(42.7%)	20	(3.6%)	1	(0.5%)
<-H, +h>	218	(34.9%)	236	(42.9%)	37	(17.5%)
<+H, -h>	26	(4.7%)	85	(15.5%)	21	(10.0%)
<-H, -h>	114	(18.2%)	209	(38.0%)	152	(72.0%)
N=	625		550		211	

The result is very encouraging. As has been predicted, the incidence of <+H, +h> is much higher in 201 (42.7%) than the other scenes. So, in 201, when K is with the professor, <+H, +h> seems to to be the form used almost exclusively. On the contrary, the incidence of <-H, -h> is the highest in 701 (72.0%) when she is with her family, and the second highest in 602 (38.0%) when she is with the cooking students. Though some <-H, -h> forms are used in 201, they do not complete sentences but are used as a kind of modifier in subordinate clauses, such as "Kore o yatta toza wa . . ." (In the days when I did this . . .), and " . . . dokoni arunda routte yu koto de . . ." (. . . while talking about where it might be . . .).

As for the other two forms, K uses <-H, +h> more often than <+H, -h> in all three scenes, especially when explaining how to cook to her students in 602. She does not use <+H, +h> there because she is higher in status and she does not feel it necessary to show respect to her students. But since the occasion is rather formal, she ends sentences wit -desu or -masu, which results in the highest incidence of <-H, +h> being in 602 (42.9%).

Compared to the other forms, <+H, -h> is rather less frequent in use. This is because of its contradictory connotation. If you employ <+H>, it means that you respect the actor. If you employ <-h>, it means that you are not polite to the addressee. So, what attitude of the speaker does <+H, -h> demonstrate when the actor and addressee is the same person?

It may be necessary now to add another interpretation of honorific expression. It is true that <+H> shows respect to the actor, but at the same time it reveals the speaker's self presentation also: by employing <+H> the speaker tries to present himself/herself to be elegant, cultured, refined, educated, etc. Thus, the speaker keeps himself/herself a little aloof from the addressee when using <+H>.

On the contrary, <-h> shows the speaker is feeling close to the addressee. So, <-h> does not always despise or look down on the addressee but can be a sign of closeness and friendliness. Therefore, <+H, -h> could mean that the speaker has a friendly feeling toward the

addressee while keeping some distance from the same addressee. This second meaning of <-h> is felt much stronger among family members and friends. To use <+h> to the people in such relations sometimes can imply the speaker's refusal of such close relationship.

It is very difficult to decide which of <+h> and <-h> would be proper to use to a particular addressee; the former raises the other person but at the same time distances that person, while the latter approaches the person but at the same time looks down on him/her.

When the actor and the addressee are different people, another problem arises. The form <+H, -h> can mean that the actor is above the speaker but the addressee is below. See the example.

10. " . . . sensei ga sa, saishoni osshatta no." (. . . you see, the professor said at first.) <Scene 701>

In 10, the one who did the act of saying is the professor; therefore, "ossha-" the honorific base of yuu (to say) is employed. As the hearers are all family members, the verb final is not honorific but simple past "-tta"<-h>. Thus, the topic and the addressee is limited when <+H, -h> is employed. This is why the use of <+H, -h> is rather infrequent in this transcription.

(4) Aizuchi (Short answers)

In order to show the speaker's psychological attitude in each scene the kinds and numbers of short answers, which are called aizuchi in Japanese, were counted. Table 8 provides the sum of such short answers. These short answers are accompanied by nodding, not necessarily showing agreement but simply showing that "I am listening to you." They are uttered reflectionally and more or less unconsciously, so the result given in Table 8 reveals K's subconscious psychological attitude in each scene.

In this Table, only five kinds of short answers are listed, but in fact there are several more in each scene. For example, in 201, there are three variants of haa: haa, haa aa, haa haa; and five variants of hai: haai, hai, hai ha, hai hai, hai hai hai.

Table 8 Short answers

	201	602	701
haa	38 (10.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)
hai	212 (56.1%)	129 (34.9%)	6 (5.4%)
aa	71 (18.8%)	59 (15.9%)	24 (21.4%)
ee	52 (13.8%)	33 (8.9%)	18 (16.1%)
un	5 (1.3%)	149 (40.3%)	63 (56.3%)
Total	378	370	112

If such small differences in pronunciation are not taken into con-

sideration, there seems to be a clear hierarchical order among these answers: haa and hai being the highest and un the lowest. If Table 7 and Table 8 are placed side by side the percentages of these short answers in each scene seem to be parallel with verb forms represented in dichotomy: haa and hai might be on the level of <+H, +h>, aa and ee on the level of <+H, -h> and <-H, +h>, and un on the level of <-H, -h>.

Note that the speaker is the same person throughout the three scenes and that the main topic of 201 is the professor requesting to taperecord K's utterance. According to the power oriented theory of human behaviors, it is the professor who must be deferent in 201 because she is asking for K's permission. However, as shown above, it is K who is deferent and respectful. This is the greatest difference from the verbal behavior in Western society. In English, for instance, whether to employ a polite expression or not is decided by what act the speaker is going to do to the addressee. If the speaker is requesting something, he/she is expected to use a polite expression even if the addressee is a person lower in social status. If the speaker is offering something which is beneficial to the addressee, the speaker feels free to use an imperative or other strong expressions; moreover, if the speaker uses a polite expression in a roundabout way, he/she will be taken impolite in such offering situations (Brown and Levinson 1978).

What decides the language form in English is what the speaker is going to do and the addressee's social status is the next thing to be considered. It is just the opposite in Japanese. To set up a relative status in the hierarchy is of foremost importance in dealing with people; otherwise, it is quite difficult to decide which language form to use to a particular addressee. If the other person is to be regarded as higher in the hierarchy, <+H, +h> must be used. If the other person is regarded as being of the same or lower status but not very close, <-H, +h> might be the best form. If the other person is either lower and/or very close, <-H, -h> would be the best choice.

This differentiated use of language forms clearly reflects the hierarchically organized Japanese society. Just as there are no two persons of exactly the same status, so are there no two language forms exactly the same on the politeness level. Every expression reflects the relative status of the interlocutors as well as the speaker's psychological feeling. Thus, the language is strictly programmed by its society, the human network.

6. Summary and conclusion

In the present paper, I proposed a hypothesis that the Japanese language reflects the society and the speaker's psychological attitude. My discussion is based on the research program in 1982-84, focusing on the use of verb forms differentiated by the people involved in the conversation. The data were taken from a questionnaire which 256 men and 271 women answered. Some of the results are given in Table 4 and Table 5. Also, the utterances of a Japanese housewife were analyzed from the same point of view.

In both cases, verbs were represented in the combination of four symbols, <H>, <h>, <+>, and <->. <H> symbolizes the base of a verb and

<h> symbolizes its ending. <+> denotes the presence of an honorific morpheme and <-> denotes its absence. Thus, all verb forms are represented in the combination of these four symbols: <+H, +h> being the highest in honorific connotation, <-H, +h> and <+H, -h> the next, and <-H, -h> the lowest. Some of the examples are given in Table 3.

The discussion was mainly on the correlation between the chosen verb form and the speaker's relation with the addressee. The result of the questionnaire shows that most informants choose a verb form taking the addressee's status into consideration.

The analysis of the transcription revealed that the speaker chose a verb form depending on who was addressed. The result is given in Table 7. This woman showed the same tendency in choosing verb forms as the informants of the questionnaire: she was very careful of the status and the relationship of the addressee. In both cases, the criteria for judging a person and deciding the language form to be used are the same: whether the addressee is above the speaker or not, and whether the addressee is close to the speaker or not.

A brief sketch of Japanese society was also given in order to compare its social organization and its language system. The conclusion is that the Japanese language has structured the social system in the verb form: the choice of honorific morphemes seems to depend on the speaker's human network and his/her psychological feeling towards the addressee. What is particular to the Japanese language is that it is syntax, as well, of course, as semantics, which must be derived directly from pragmatics.

Thus, this paper has shown one phase of a language whose syntax is directly related to pragmatic conditions. It is quite easy, therefore, to see the relation between syntactic features and pragmatic factors through the Japanese language, because it reflects this fact in the use of honorifics, only if it is to be analyzed in the way presented by this paper, which is totally different from the ways presented so far by other researchers of this language.

Notes

(1) The research project from which this paper took its data was supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education from 1982 to 1984. The project was conducted by a team consisting of five researchers: Sachiko Ide (the chief), Akiko Kawasaki, Shoko Ikuta, Hitomi Haga, and myself. The theme was: "Josei no keigo no gengo-keishiki to kinou" [The forms and functions of polite expressions by women]. The result was published in three volumes and several papers. Hori (1986) is one of them.
(2) The present paper is based on the questionnaire and the transcription of conversations which were taken within the project of 1982-84. The analysis was done in another project of mine from 1986 to 1988, which was also supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education. The theme was "Shakai-tekio no tame no, taijin-kankei-chosetsu-kikou to shite toraeta gengo-kodo [Language behaviors viewed as a function regulating interpersonal relationships for social adaptation].
(3) This paper was originally presented at the 8th World Conference of

Applied Linguistics (16-21 August 1987, University of Sydney, New South Wales, Australia).

References

Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson. 1978. "Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena." E. N. Goody, ed. Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction. Cambridge University Press, 56-311.

Fraser, Bruce and William Nolen. 1981. "The association of deference with linguistic form." International Journal of the Sociology of Language: the sociolinguistics of deference and politeness 27, 93-109.

Hori, Motoko. 1986. "A sociolinguistic analysis of the Japanese honorifics." Journal of Pragmatics 10, 161-174.

Ide, Sachiko, Tunao Ogino, Akiko Kawasaki, and Shoko Ikuta. 1986. Nihonjin to Amerikajin no keigo-koudou [Politeness behavior of the Japanese and the Americans]. Nan-undo.

Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. Principles of pragmatics. Longman.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

Peng, Fred C. C. 1974. "Communicative Distance." Language Sciences August, 32-40.

Zimin, Susan. 1981. "Sex and politeness: factors in first- and second-language use." International Journal of the Sociology of Language 27, 35-58.